



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in 1886 by Professor Wright, and his judgment of its value was so favorable, that the Society turned the collection over to the University. Professor Wright at once set about preparing a catalogue of them and the movement which has at length resulted in the present catalogue began. A notable acquisition was made in 1876 in a complete twelfth-century copy of the Harklensian version of the New Testament together with the Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, of which last no Syriac form had previously been known. The same manuscript contains at the end of John the important account of the version, from Thomas of Harkel. Add. 1970, of the eighteenth century, preserves an interesting form of the Apocalypse, a book rather rarely found in Syriac, differing from Lee's text, and purporting to have been translated from an Arabic version made from the Latin. Of the whole, about one-fourth are hymns, psalters, prayers, and liturgical books; rather more than thirty are biblical, and nearly a score are of works of Barhebraeus.

The catalogue of the S. P. C. K. manuscripts was undertaken by Professor Wright in 1887, his intention being to describe the other Syriac manuscripts in the Cambridge library in an appendix. His death in 1889 prevented the execution of this intention, but the main portion of the Catalogue, pp. 1-975, had already been prepared. From 1889 until 1900 the project seems to have slumbered. In 1900 the library syndicate entrusted to Mr. Cook the preparation of the Appendix (pp. 977-1290) in which the remaining manuscripts are more briefly described. The descriptions here and in the main part of the catalogue are concise but comprehensive, and are accompanied by full lists, in Syriac and English, of the titles contained in each manuscript, important notes and colophons being frequently reproduced in full. A series of six indices concludes the work. The use of these volumes is much facilitated by the clear and beautiful Syriac characters employed in them, and the general excellence of their mechanical execution.

When it is remembered that more than three-fourths of this great catalogue was prepared by Professor Wright between 1887 and 1889, it may occasion some surprise that the preparation of the concluding fourth, the Appendix, should have delayed the publication of the work a dozen years. This is in part explained by the losses sustained by Cambridge in the successive deaths of Professors Wright (1889), Bensly (1893), and Robertson Smith (1894), all of whom were interested in the preparation of this Catalogue.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

---

### KEILINSCHRIFTEN UND DAS ALTE TESTAMENT.<sup>1</sup>

The new edition of Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* is an independent work that must be judged entirely on its own merits and not as a new form of Schrader's well-known book. It has

<sup>1</sup> KEILINSCHRIFTEN UND DAS ALTE TESTAMENT. Von H. Zimmerl. 3. Auflage. II, Religion und Sprache. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard, 1902. Complete, M. 21.

nothing in common with the latter but the name, and there is no good reason why Schrader's name should have appeared at all in connection with it. The first part dealing with the historical and geographical phases is by Dr. H. Winckler, and this again is quite independent in its character from Professor Zimmern's contribution, which might just as well have been published as a separate work. His methods differ totally from that pursued by Winckler and although he aims occasionally by a footnote or a reference to establish a bond of relationship between the second part and Winckler's first part, he succeeds merely in conveying the impression that he does not agree with Winckler's deductions, commonly designated by him as "weitgehende," from the data furnished by the Old Testament or cuneiform sources.

Whether this complete departure from Schrader's method of following the subject, book by book and chapter by chapter according to the arrangement of the Old Testament collection, is an improvement is exceedingly doubtful. The general verdict of scholars is that convenience of consultation has been sacrificed in this new venture to originality, and it is more than likely that ere long there will be needed a real successor to the second edition of Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*; and this verdict is made without in any way calling into question the merits of either Winckler's or Zimmern's work. Winckler's part is indeed a remarkably able and astute exposition of his theories of Old Testament history and even if one is not prepared to accept these theories, his pages teem with valuable suggestions and he has undoubtedly thrown unexpected light upon many a problem of Old Testament history by his learning and acute reasoning as well as by his ingenious combinations. Zimmern is less brilliant than Winckler but what he lacks in this respect he makes up in sobriety, and he comes much closer to the promise held out in the "joint" introduction to the work, to embody in it only the *ascertained* and generally accepted results, though even Zimmern at times steps far beyond these limits and gives us conjectures and possibilities instead of net results.

The plan of his work is simple and yet comprehensive. He begins with a discussion of the chief deities of the Babylonian Pantheon, presenting in each case the general traits of the god or goddess, and passes on to a consideration of the actual or possible bearings on certain Old Testament passages, or the traces of the influence of the deity in question in the Old Testament with occasional excursions into the field of the New Testament, of the Apochrypha, and Pseudographs. After the gods proper come the divine messengers, the spirits and demons, and the division ends with a valuable though incomplete discussion of foreign gods in Babylonian literature.

The second division of the book is taken up with Babylonian myths, more particularly the creation stories, the deluge tale, and portions of the Gilgamesh epic, the cult and bearings of the religious literature as well as the astronomical system, and, lastly, the views of life after death. The third division is a very brief section of only ten pages, illustrating

the relationship of the Babylonian language to the Hebrew. Professor Zimmern apologizes for the brief treatment accorded this very important section and also for the insufficient discussion of the cult, literature, and beliefs which are disposed of in about fifty pages. One cannot help regretting that over one hundred pages should have been taken up with the Pantheon, and there was also no special reason why the Gilgamesh epic should have been treated at length. Much of what is said in connection with the Babylonian and Assyrian gods would be in place in a volume on the religion of Babylonia and Assyria, but would hardly be looked for in a work devoted to illustrating the bearings of Babylonian culture on the religion of the Old Testament. In view of Professor Zimmern's gratuitous and misleading remark on my own work on the religion of Babylonia and Assyria, which he reluctantly confesses to be the "best" book on the subject, I may be pardoned for noting that what he has to say about the gods adds but little to the representation of them in my own work. However, leaving this aside, the value of this portion of Professor Zimmern's work consists almost exclusively in the discussion of the bearing of those gods on the Old Testament. One cannot help feeling that at times his combinations, although generally brought forward with due reserve, are very precarious. To choose one example of many, to see in the Old Testament conception of Yahweh dwelling in heaven and surrounded by the heavenly host a trace, albeit an indirect one, of the Babylonian Anu cult, is quite unnecessary. Since Yahweh is, as is now generally held, originally a storm god whose manifestations are seen in thunder and lightning, where else could the poetic and popular fancy place his seat except in the heavens, with the prominence accorded to moon and sun worship in the early religion of the inhabitants of Palestine? Many of the parallels between the Babylonian and Hebrew conceptions do not point to borrowing on the one side or the other. Still less plausible is the supposition first voiced by Winckler and adopted by Zimmern that the figure of the king in the book of Esther is modeled upon Anu. The late date of this book in connection with the unimportant part taken by Anu in the *popular* phases of the Babylonian mythology constitute fatal objections.

There was no particular reason why Bel of Nippur should have been included in the section on the Pantheon since Zimmern admits that none of the Old Testament references to a Babylonian Bel refer to the chief deity of Nippur but to Bel-Marduk under which heading, therefore, the subject could have been disposed of. Here again the combination of the title *Shadû-Rabû* (great mountain) given to Bel with the Hebrew *Shaddai* and which Zimmern notes as "not impossible" is to be rejected as without foundation. Apart from the fact that the title is also assigned to other gods, the philological objections are formidable. Even if it be assumed that the pronunciation *Shaddai* is artificial, in order to connect it with the popular etymology, the presence of the Yôdh at the end of the word will still have to be accounted for.

When we come to such gods as Sin, Marduk, and Ishtar we reach

safer ground. These eminently popular deities are precisely of a kind to exert an influence upon the cult of peoples which came in contact with Babylonia. To be sure some of the theories recently advanced, more particularly by Hommel, as to the predominant significance of the moon cult among the early Semites, are marked by extreme extravagance and it is refreshing to note the cautious manner in which Zimmern approaches the theme (p. 365). He contents himself with the theory for which there is sufficient evidence, that traces of the Babylonian conception about Sin may be detected in Yahweh. As to the mythological element in the stories of the patriarchs in the book of Genesis he wisely postpones a consideration of the subject. Perhaps the most important part of this first division is the one devoted to Marduk. From a brief but admirable account of the character assumed by Marduk in the Babylonian religion and certain features in his cult, he passes on to the traces in Marduk to be noted in the conception formed of Yahweh; and advancing to the New Testament he finds no less than fourteen points of contact between Marduk and instances in the life of Jesus or attributes ascribed to the latter. It will be, of course, for New Testament students to pronounce the verdict on this exceedingly important part of Professor Zimmern's work, but even outsiders must be struck by some of the parallels, and it would appear that Professor Zimmern has conclusively established, at least, the general theme that mythological influences emanating ultimately from Babylonia continued to be at work in Palestine until a far later period than only a short time ago was supposed to be possible.

Coming to the chapter devoted to the cosmology of the Babylonian and Hebrew, nothing better has yet been presented on the subject than Professor Zimmern's discussion. An opportunity is presented to him here of enlarging on many of the suggestions contained in Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*. Another very valuable section is formed by the discussion of Babylonian priests and temples in which in a brief space a great deal of valuable material, particularly from the religious literature, is gathered, and it is to be exceedingly regretted that lack of space prevented Professor Zimmern from treating this important subject as fully as it deserves. He has, however, brought together sufficient evidence to make it no longer doubtful that the Hebrew ritual and many features of the Hebrew cult are due to Babylonian influence. It would have been valuable if, in connection with this question of Babylonian influence, Professor Zimmern had also directed attention to the large number of evidently intentional deviations from Babylonian methods likewise to be observed in the Pentateuchal codes. Indeed this phase of the subject of *Babel und Bibel* has been too much neglected by Assyriologists who in their anxiety to find parallels overlook intentional contrasts which are equally important. Parallel to the adaptation of Babylonian myths and traditions to specifically Hebrew beliefs and traditions, to be noted in the early chapters of Genesis, we have the intentional differentiation of the cult from foreign features

wherever such differentiation is possible. In fact the process involved in the adoption of Babylonian ideas, Babylonian ritual, and Babylonian laws is much more complicated than is ordinarily assumed. The cases of actual adoption are rare in comparison with *adaptation* involving more or less profound modifications of the original Babylonian material. Professor Zimmern's work illustrates the justification of such a theory and Old Testament scholars and Assyriologists alike will be glad to acknowledge their deep obligation to him for having put together an enormous amount of valuable material gathered in the course of many years of study. It will be possible with this material so clearly brought before us to take up detailed points in a much more satisfactory manner than before and while, therefore, Professor Zimmern's work is not to be regarded as the successor of Schrader's, which is still very useful though antiquated in many parts, it will prepare the way, as will also Winckler's part of the work, for a comprehensive work setting forth on the basis of the material supplied by Winckler and Zimmern, the actual relationship existing between the Old Testament and Babylonian culture, religion and history. As it is my purpose to touch upon numerous points of detail in Zimmern's work at the proper place in the forthcoming parts of the German edition of my *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, I trust that I may be permitted to refer to this work instead of covering the ground again in this notice.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

---

### THE ARAMAISMS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.<sup>1</sup>

Gesenius in his *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift*, Leipzig, 1815, made the first attempt to discuss in a scientific way the influence of the Aramaic on the Hebrew language after the Exile. Since then this question has often been ventilated, and in many monographs Aramaisms of certain pieces of Old Testament literature were pointed out and were used for the dating of such pieces. But no systematic discussion of all Aramaisms in the Old Testament has ever been published until this year, when the well-known Old Testament scholar, Professor Kautzsch, brought out his book, which appeared as *Hallesches Osterprogramm für 1901-1902*.

The linguistic problems which arise from a consideration of the influence exercised by one language upon another are manifold and interesting, but they are in most cases extremely difficult and often almost defy solution. For several reasons this is particularly true with regard to the Aramaisms in the Old Testament. First, though the amount of literature preserved to us is very small, the genuine Hebrew vocabulary was undoubtedly much larger than is now known to us. Hence, in many cases, a word which does not occur in old Hebrew before

<sup>1</sup> DIE ARAMAISMEN IM ALTEN TESTAMENT. I. Lexikalischer Teil. Von E. Kautzsch. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1903. 8vo; v + 111 pp. M. 3.20.